UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES

The 827th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
Held on February 8, 2024 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter 227

A. PRESENTATION

Policy Work on Academic Integrity and Syllabus Requirements
Allison Butler, Chair of the Academic Matters Council

Chair Butler: Thank you so much for having me. My name is Allison Butler. I am the Chair of the Academic Matters Council. Two of our big projects this year is to work on updating what is currently called the Academic Honesty Policy. We are going to call it the Academic Integrity Policy, and we are also in collaboration with the Graduate Council working on some updated syllabus requirements. What I'd like to do today is just share what we've got so far, and what we're working on for the semester.

We're going to start with academic honesty. So the motivation to change the academic honesty policy. If any of you have spent any time with it recently, it is very much a 20th century policy trying to operate in 21st century classrooms. It is outdated. I've talked to a couple of the folks that worked on the latest iteration, and it was a ton of work that went into it. But at this point we need to expand it to our 21st century classrooms.

Academic dishonesty presents differently now than in the past, and it will no doubt present differently in the future. We're trying to build a policy that is both attentive to the 21st century while also flexible and not super trendy, as it were, to hopefully capture what changes we know about and those that we don't yet know about. For anybody who has spent time with the policy, it is quite often understood as unclear for students, cumbersome for faculty, and we're asking whether there is a way to make it more streamlined and manageable for all.

So that is our hope.

Our goals for the new policy. We want to build a policy that starts with education that is educative for students, that is educative for faculty, as well to understand the environment in which we are teaching and learning. That is efficient for faculty, that can be easily understood and followed by students, faculty, and staff.

Punitive action certainly may be warranted, but we are hoping to build a policy that starts with student education and creates a space for faculty and student communication. I've been a little bit hesitant about the language thus far because what we are going to do is update the language to academic integrity versus academic honesty.

It will include some language on generative AI and some work that also acknowledges digital dishonesty. We've expanded some definitions to include generative AI. We are looking at potentially

building a signed commitment to academic integrity that all students entering UMass, first year and transfer students, would sign upon their matriculation.

We're looking at clarifying and centralizing student rights to that point. By the way, we're also clarifying faculty participation and faculty expectations. That just isn't in the draft that was shared with you ahead of the meeting.

We're looking for ways to support greater autonomy of faculty if desired. Particularly when dealing with multiple cases of dishonesty within, for example, one exam or one class. But I wanted to give you the place where we are right now with some highlights. So this highlights, in terms of the opening of the policy is:

"*Upon your matriculation to UMass you signed a commitment to academic integrity…*".

One of the things that we did in our conversations, was tried to start to build a policy as if it existed. So we've got some really declarative language here, being the sort of center of the policy. But really what we wanted to do with that declarative language was, have it there so that we could find what was missing, see what holes we could poke into it and build on it from there.

So everything is written declaratively. But it is all very, very much still a draft. So we are looking at the potential for a commitment to academic honesty as part of student entry to UMass both our first years and our transfer students.

Couple of things that have changed or being updated in our definitions. By the way, some of these have been updated further still. We've got language on, including generative AI, both under cheating and plagiarism. You will see in this version there's some attention paid particularly to in this language here, with plagiarism "knowingly representing the words or ideas of another" that is already in our draft been expanded. We've got art, creative work, research, etc.

So we've already kind of expanded some of our language as part of the listening tour which you're all invited to be a part of. We have some work on how this would happen in terms of responses to suspected dishonesty. We've got to work on our timing a little bit. Right now, we have it set up with a sort of 10 days, 5 days, 5 business days as a way of keeping it efficient. Our goal with these date deadlines is so that faculty can get back to teaching, and students can get back to "student-ing".

But maybe this time isn't exactly going to work out perfectly. We've already had some conversations with folks and have built in some language about if there is proactive communication, the timeline can be expanded because we know that some of this isn't going to be solved right away. Our goal there is to really talk about talk through student and faculty communication. We are also potentially building the opportunity for faculty to assign or grade course penalty without significant extra consultation. There would need to be materials filed with the office of academic integrity. But this would be a way that we're looking at for potentially making it a more efficient process.

We're trying to talk with certain folks about whether or not that actually would make sense. We are looking at appropriate sanctions. We're going to build an appendix with potential sanctions so that faculty, and students have a better understanding of what might match. Like an infraction with a consequence. We also want to make sure that what is really clear is that this isn't connected to behavioral conduct. This actually doesn't go through as of now doesn't go through the Dean of Students Office. It's not considered behavior or conduct violation in that way. So we're trying to also make sure

that we're keeping it clear as an understanding of academic consequences. We're building a rubric with some ideas about that.

One of the other ideas is the potential for an integrity point person within a college. That would be a support for the faculty member and a support for the office of academic integrity to help manage the cases particularly, not exclusively, but particularly if there are massive cases of cheating. If you teach a 500-person lecture class, and you suspect 200-300 students of cheating on an exam, the rest of your semester could conceivably be managing all of those forms. So we're trying to find a way to make it again so that faculty can get back to teaching, and that it is more efficient.

This is again, this highlight here is submitting, a singular form to a college point person to manage. This would be about potentially discussing or outreach to students coordinating with the office of academic integrity, all of those next steps we're seeing is implementation. So we're trying to sort of see what it looks like as the policy. Then the last highlight here is that we are going to name the policy, the Academic Integrity Policy. So we would be expanding the location of it to the office of academic integrity. We're going to be highlighting, and this is again something that has already been updated, some student rights, so that students have a better understanding of what could potentially happen after academic dishonesty is suspected.

We have built onto this in our draft form faculty expectations, so that we have ways for faculty to be clear, both in their syllabi and in their assignments. Then subsequently, in any cases of suspicion about what is expected of faculty to follow the policy. Then some smaller language on formal charges which are slightly different than informal charges.

Our next steps or our current steps, is we are visiting multiple campus stakeholders on a listening tour. If you are interested in having a different, like an individual conversation, please email me. I'm happy to come talk to you wherever and about whatever with the policy. As I said, we've already been on a few stops on this listening tour, so things have expanded pretty significantly while still keeping it to 3-1/2 to 4 pages. We are not going to extend this to 16. Really sort of expanding some of the language that we're using.

So the draft that you're seeing up here has already been built up a little bit. Our job, in terms of looking at next steps beyond the policy, would be to build that commitment to academic integrity, to work with the current informal and formal resolution forms to see if they match.

We've got several appendices that we're building on, both sanctions commensurate with infraction. Also some communication like ways to communicate with students. Ways to maybe organize an assignment by assignment or course by course, explanation of what is and is not permitted. Certainly we will compare and contrast this with the grievance policy to make sure that there aren't contradictions or conflicts in the process. So it is very much a working draft. Again, please reach out if you'd like to have a further conversation.

If you'd like to be part of the listening tour. Maybe you already are. I know some people in this room have probably gotten several emails from me with multiple drafts. So thank you.

So the other thing that academic matters is working on along with the grad council is updating our syllabus requirements. We are looking at the syllabus as a student equity and student belonging. That a well-crafted syllabus with clear information, can do a lot to help students understand their role in each individual class.

Potentially, the differences between their classes and support their understanding of the university. We also see a well formulated syllabus as a great way to help our graduate instructors learn how to teach, learn how to build syllabi, to support new faculty, and to support faculty new to UMass Amherst for understanding what the requirements are and what the expectations are.

What we are looking at for the proposed requirements. Some of them are pretty basic and there's stuff that's already being done. Course number and name, obviously, number of credits meeting times and classroom or online location, professor name and contact information, office hours, if relevant, the T.A., course description, the student learning objectives, information on their required course, materials, assessments, assignments and grade breakdown, course content, attendance policy, makeup policy, grade scale, and then already required our statements on accommodations, academic honesty, and Title IX.

Then we're looking at strongly recommended pronoun policies, land acknowledgments, classroom civility and respect, student success resources. If you have a particular generative AI policy for your class, and maybe how you communicate with students outside of class. Most all of this doesn't need to be reinvented right or started over from the beginning. We have so many campus resources that these can be linked to. As more of us maybe move into a more digital using Canvas like a digital LMS, we can certainly expand some of the materials on our syllabi without having to print out too many pieces of paper. So we see it both as maybe things that can be linked for students, but also there's just a bit more room in the digital LMS for this.

So these are our 2 projects. I'm hoping to do the listening tour by spring break just because that feels like a nice time to listen to folks. But this is what we have been working on for the semester.

Thank you.

Questions:

Senator Sher: I saw that on the requirements grade scale is now proposed as a requirement. I looked it up previously. It was says that it was something that was usually recommended by reviewers. The question I have about grade scale, and maybe I should know this is, how does including a grade scale, interact with having a curve in the class or allowing for a curve?

Chair Butler: So my best guess would be that maybe you put up the grade scale, and then per assignment, or say something about what your curve would be that would then reflect what those different numbers are. It's not meant to be like a "This must be what your grades are."

It's more the idea of 1: supporting faculty, and particularly grad instructors and understanding the grading policies at UMass, but also for students, is to see how their work is going to be measured.

So if it's going to be measured with a curve, and they can know that ahead of time that can be really helpful for their understanding of the breadth of the semester.

Senator Sher: If I can just follow up. My one concern would be that sometimes a curve requires some flexibility on the part of faculty, because they didn't predict how well students would do. And they don't want to say, give everybody a bad grade. And so I think that whatever the policy is should allow for appropriate flexibility for those sorts of situations.

Chair Butler: I think really the motivation behind that, as part of the policy is that that's exactly what happens, but that it's made clear to students as much ahead of time as possible.

Senator Katz: Last semester, over 40% of the students actually cheated on the final project. So while we're revamping some of the language to do with generative AI and other things, one thing I ran into because I never really dove deep into the policy before and now I was forced to was all these things about business days and things. I mean, it sort of makes sense when you're during the semester.

But once it's the final project due on the last day of the final exam period I ran into all sorts of difficulties like, what's the definition of a business day? The university is closed between Christmas and New Years. Does that count?

No one even knew anything. I tried asking people. No one knew the answer to that. The other problem, of course, is that we're not in term. So students aren't mandated to be reading their email every day during break. So you know that was the other problem I ran into. Running into students, and even some claiming they never got the email or whatever. So there's no way of really registering these timelines. I'm wondering if we can, first of all, make less ambiguous language, maybe saying that you know it's during it, you know, we can only count days during term or something. Because it's not just whether the university is open or close. There's also the issues of responsible days for the faculty. Which should I really be having to deal with all this between Christmas and New Years? That's not really what I want to be doing then.

Students aren't responsive. They're on vacation whatever. So I was just hoping we could be a little more specific on what some of those things mean. I would recommend restricting it to when we're in term, or something, so that it was more obvious. Especially for things that happened for finals. So the things that will happen if it happened at the end of the spring semester going into the summer. Students could disappear. They're not necessarily reading their emails, you know. It's kind of difficult to follow up on this.

Chair Butler: So that's absolutely one of the things that we're looking at in terms of something that we want to build is guidelines for managing academic dishonesty and a timeline that's close to the end of the semester, and then clarifying how we make use of the language. Again, the initial part is, if a faculty member suspects academic dishonesty to reach out within X days. What we also want to be adding to that is, as I said before, that sometimes that communication might take a little bit longer in good faith. So there would be something within it.

We haven't developed this language only just very drafty of if active, or good faith communication or proactive communication. But yes, we will absolutely we are absolutely looking into. If end of semester, then what if this? Then what? And we want to be as clear in the language within the policy as possible, and then also build appendices that would be like for different or special circumstances, so that, looking through the core of the policy is efficient, and then there would be, you know, a little bit of a flow chart or an arrow to particular situations. But that's absolutely a conversation that we've been having is what happens at the end of the semester.

Senator Olsen: To what extent have you looked at peer institutions and compared what you're proposing to what our peers are doing. The second thing is related. All the colleges and universities that I studied at, we signed an honor pledge for every exam, for every essay. It's just a statement that was put on there that you then initialed and why not do that, so that it's reminded every time. I welcome the one they do

when they enter. But I think they're signing a lot of things, and they're not paying attention to that. But by seeing it every time they'll get it in their head that this has consequences right.

Third thing, please don't propose so many required things on the syllabi. It gets so long that the students just will throw it away right. I see it's all good stuff, but you know it's our intellectual property, too. It's our freedom of speech, and the more and more that we mandate the less and less free speech that we, as professors, have.

Chair Butler: To the extent that looked at peer institutions. Yes, we have looked at both our sort of size and state institution peers as well as our neighborhood peers. Obviously the other 4 colleges are completely different in size, but knowing that our students may be taking classes through the 5 College Consortium, we wanted to sort of make sure that we were familiar with that. I will say some of the smaller colleges revamp their academic integrity policies pretty regularly, like every couple of years, which sounds really overwhelming for a place this size.

So we're trying to kind of find a happy medium to that. We have seen a couple of different things. Right now, our academic honesty policy sits in the academics, in academic affairs and many other institutions, it sits in Student Affairs. So we're also trying to make sure that where it sits will be the best possible place.

In terms of the honor pledge before every exam or every essay. I think that's something we might need to regroup and talk about whether or not that is something that each that we could mandate for each individual course or each individual faculty member. I think what we are looking at for signing a commitment to academic integrity is comes along with other activities potentially. that it's not exclusively a paragraph that gets signed amongst the 1,000 other pieces of paper that they're signing.

But maybe we could see it as something that's part of an introduction to their residents or part of NSOT. Or something that IPO does, particularly for our international students, who might be coming from primary and secondary education that has a totally different relationship to integrity. So we're really not envisioning it exclusively as a one-off but maybe something that can get built into the culture of the university.

Then to your, to your question about too many requirements mandated on the syllabus. Yeah, we've I mean, we've talked about that a lot. I think the upside of the requirements is that even if students aren't reading it closely, they have it as a resource. So it can be presented as a resource guide. If it gets presented digitally, then they aren't throwing it away right? They can ignore it on canvas, but it's going to be there for them. One thing I tell my class all the time is that we all have my class, and I have very different bed times that if they're doing their work at midnight, I'm long gone. But they have the reference of the syllabus to help out. So that's the way that we're trying to envision it, as maybe it becomes a reference for students rather than something that needs to be memorized. Again, hopefully, with learning management systems cannot be so many pieces of paper that we're printing out.

Senator Ho: We have a question that came up with our discussion in our department pertaining to what happens if a student refuses to sign the form, and what are the consequences, or how do you go and proceed with it? Because is it going to be something that's going to be very arduous and difficult? Kind of like the going to appeals court and seeing if the prosecuting attorney gets tired kind of thing.

Chair Butler: So one possibility. If a student refuses to sign the informal resolution which then goes to the office of academic integrity is that the faculty could start a formal resolution which then triggers a hearing. So yes, it probably would be going right to a hearing. But that's the way it currently is. We're sort of thinking about that. But we also want to make sure that the signing of the informal agreement and the communication between the faculty and the student isn't….I mean, there is a built in power dynamic. So we're also trying to make sure that it can be understood by students that they can understand their process in it, that it is not something that is overly coercive. So we're also going to be putting in the draft places that students can go to for support to understand the process.

Senator Bauner: Several questions. The first is actually following up on also having all those require required statements. Would it be possible to put those on Spire or something, and just have them accessible to everyone? Because if students take 4, 5, 6 classes, they are just getting 4, 5, 6 times the same stuff, and it's really just cluttering the syllabus up.

Chair Butler: I don't know if Spire has that flexibility. But Canvas can.

Vice Chancellor Misra: So the essence of your question is, how do we get the data to students consistently? Spire is a terrible interface like, just acknowledge it. It's okay. You've come to terms with you, can. It's okay. I agree.

The essence of the issue is data, having it consistent, having presented it. I think that's the conversation we can have. So if I have to come to academic matters at some point, I do that. So I understand the problem you're asking. Spire is what we've got. We need to bridge those two. But, God willing, we will not make people log into Spire any more than we need to.

Chair Butler: But now Spire is going to crash, cause we all just laughed at it. I'm just saying. There are Canvas like little course modules that potentially could be a possibility. Maybe.

Senator Bauner: Yeah, I'm not married to Spire. That was the first thing that came to mind. Second thing. What is the pronoun policy? I've never actually heard of that. I'm not sure there are options.

Chair Butler: If students go by, she/her/hers, or he/him, they/them/theirs. So how the pronouns that students use that match with their identity.

Senator Bauner: So I do have the option to use random pronouns?

Chair Butler: Speaking of Spire. You could actually go there, it's one place where Spire is pretty forward thinking. Students can enter in their pronouns and then it shows up on the course roster.

Senator Bauner: My question was, if a student tells me they go by he/him or whatever, do I have the option to call them she/her? Because that would be weird.

Chair Butler: I would say no.

Senator Bauner: But that kind of gets us back to almost the same as those required statements. If basically, everyone has the same policy, maybe we can just put them somewhere centrally and that's just what we are going to do as a university. I don't know whether possible.

Chair Butler: So our purpose with the pronoun policy was just as something that was recommended for students to be able to see that that is being thought of in a particular class, but we're not putting it in as a requirement.

Senator Bauner: I understand that. But the language was saying strongly recommended. So you seem to be kind of getting back to the cluttering.

Chair Butler: I mean, we're not expecting people to put in a pronoun statement. We just think it is good practice and supportive of students, particularly those that might be transitioning as they come to UMass, and seeing that that is something that is supported in their classroom could be helpful for their sense of belonging.

Senator Francis: I am the Chair of the Academic Matters Council Course Subcommittee. It is a thankless job. But I get to work with Allison. So it is a thankful job.

I just wanted to address a few of the questions. I look at a lot of syllabi. I also engage a lot with CTL around inclusive teaching. If you look at the CTL website and you look at their inclusive syllabi, a lot of this information is there. The reason is because there are students who come to college that don't have a lot of prior knowledge about college, about how things work here. And they don't know this information. So, in fact, I know that syllabi get very long but I asked my students to think of it more as a resource versus something that they should just be reading through. If they have a question about the makeup policy, then they can go to the syllabus, and they can see what my makeup policy is versus somebody else's makeup policy which could be different. So it's a resource. It's a resource for students who do not understand typically how these things work or may not have sort of institutional knowledge.

In regards to the pronoun policy, I have one in my syllabus and I think it's basically just an indication that you're aware that people may be trans, that they may be transitioning, that they may be genderfluid and that you are open to, using whatever pronouns that they would like to use right? And so it's just it's I think it's just a nice thing to put in the syllabus, to just indicate that you are an ally, and that you are happy to make them as comfortable in the classroom as you can possibly do.

Chair Butler: Just to quickly add to that. I previously was the Director of Undergraduate Advising for my Department of Communication, and we would have students that would come in as first years, or transfers who were unable to be “out” or transitioning at home, and this was the safest place. That pronoun policy meant a lot for them in order to understand how they belonged in the classroom. That they could come to their teacher or their advisor or their T.A., and know that the work that they were doing on themselves was respected. So it really meant a lot to them.

Secretary Paik: So as we're thinking about the policy process going forward, it might be useful for everyone to be thinking about what we would want to see as required elements. Also, as Senator Olsen indicates, that sort of a forced kind of speech that we're requiring of faculty versus those things that we want to think of as sort of recommended practices. Which faculty have the option of adopting if they choose to do so. I anticipate we'll have some interesting and hopefully, a vigorous debate about those issues. Thank you.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Interim Provost Malone: Just a quick update on some searches. Current plans are to bring candidates for the Provost position to campus in late February and early March. I'm not going to announce any dates today because they haven't been confirmed. We have to confirm them with once we invite candidates, the Searches for Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts, and Dean in the College of Education are progressing. Intentionally a bit later in the semester, but in time to finish before graduation.

Vice Chancellor Misra: Briefly on the Chief Human Resources office search. We're in a very similar timeline to the Provost search. Candidates coming in again that late February/March. Both these dates are being coordinated with the Chancellor's office and other offices. So again, I don't want to specify specific days as we're working out details. But I want to thank the search committee for their work to date. So far it's been a very positive experience.

Senior Vice Provost Hajir: Very similar message to Vice Chancellor Misra's message for the search for Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life. That committee's work is going forward very well, and we anticipate campus visits around the same timeframe late-February/early-March. Ours may go a little bit into past Spring break. We're not sure yet, but we're hoping to have it done before spring break to have the visits then.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Paik: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Welcome everyone to spring semester. I hope your courses and semester are going well so far.

So I have a couple announcements. First, I'd like to introduce our new office manager, who started in December, Connie Thacker. It's great having a new office manager in place, as you know, Karen Greene retired last year she actually retired in June and stayed on a O-3 appointments part time. So we've been operating for most of all semester with only part time help. So it's great to have a full time staff member back in the Senate office. So please feel free to reach out to Connie. She has the same email address.

Second, we are going about to undertake our traditional provision of the bylaws, which takes 3 meetings, and so we'll be starting that probably at the next meeting, since there are only 3 meetings left and there will be 3 readings of the bylaws. We received revisions from the councils. If you have things you would like to implement, please let me know, and I can bring it through the Rules Committee.

Also, we will, having our annual election cycle occurring in March. So if your term is ending this spring, and you're interested in staying on the Senate, please let us know so we could put you on the ballot for election cycle in March. If you know a colleague who's interested in serving, please send them our way so we can reach out to them, see if they would be interested in serving in the Senate, and then also adding them to the ballot if they willing to do so.

In terms of some of the things that I need your help on. We have a lot of nominations to make. One of the things that we're currently operating on at the university is, we don't currently have an Ombuds person. So if you know any faculty members that would like to serve on a Ombuds search committee. Please let me know. I will send those names to the Rules Committee.

In addition given that we now have an ad hoc committee on departmental statements. If you know any faculty that are interested serving on that ad hoc committee, please send me their names and self-nominations are greatly appreciate as well.

Lastly, just wanted to update you all on some things that are occurring in terms of consultations with administration.

The first thing is internal tuition waivers. So, as you know, when graduate students are hired by other units. particularly say, a master student, the department that has that master student loses the tuition. We've referred that mattered to the Academic Programs and Budget Council. So we'll be getting update about some possible adjustments to that current financial system.

Also, we are currently starting to talk about attendance policies and medical excuses. As you know, there's been a lot of issues related to attendance. So we're looking starting to look at other universities. I've reached out to Senior Vice Provost Hajir, and we started coordinating about examining how other universities handle both this, both from a policy perspective, but also in terms of administrative implementation. I will update you on how that's going and whether that works to be allocated to a particular council going forward.

Lastly, there's been a lot of stuff bubbling around about general education. There is some discussion about undertaking a significant General Education Review to assess where we are. It's been, I believe. more than 13 years since the last General Education Review, and since there have been so many requests recently about different Gen Ed revisions. One of the discussions that's currently taking place is that of undertaking a significant investment to do to bring in some external review of our general education system.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator Hoagland: The trustees met, and their committees met in early December, and has been typical for the last few years the discussions nearly all focused on financial matters. I'll bring up a few of those, and I don't think there was any major developments, however. As we probably all know, the State has had some fiscal troubles this year. The system is still aiming for a 2% operating margin by 2025. The current operating margin is actually larger than that, as we've heard it past meetings.

In December they presented the 5-year forecast for the system, and I'll give you a few parameters that are used in that forecast. So these are predictions, they're not planning, but that is that tuition and fee rates will go up at about 2 ½% a year for the next 5 years. Salaries will rise at about 3% a year, and revenue and expenses costs will rise at about 4% a year. So that's what the board is thinking as they project forward.

The last thing I'll mention is the group of delegates get together after each board meeting and discuss issues of the system, and one thing that came up again is basically, where's UMass Global? Their forecast did not include UMass Global this year, which is different than in past years. There's no information about the finances of that entity. We don't understand as a group why the system is not providing that information.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Vice President: So I'm not the president of the MSP or the co-president. Eve is out sick. She does so much for us, and sometimes it takes her voice out.

I'm Sigrid Schmalzer. I'm a professor in the history department, and I'm a Vice President of the MSP. We have a few announcements. So first of all, MSP has heard from faculty and librarians all across campus who are concerned about our students who are arrested for their peaceful sit-in in Whitmore.

We've also heard from department heads and chairs, parents, and other groups who, regardless of their position on the crisis in the Middle East itself, are extremely upset about the campus's response to the students.

We have a very simple ask. The Chancellor should review the campus decision and should impose reprimands on the students rather than probation. To explain. The students were given probation under the student code of conduct and probation has negative consequences for their careers, preventing them from study abroad or obtaining R.A. positions, and these probations remain on their record for 7 years, which harms their chances of getting certain jobs or professional school opportunities. Reprimands under the same policy would not have those long-term implications for students with otherwise spotless records. So we're urging the Administration to treat the students the same as other students who where arrested in similar peaceful protests in the past by giving them a reprimand instead of probation. It's an easy fix that would be consistent with campus policies and UMass past practice, and would satisfy faculty, students, and the wider community.

Second, MSP and the Administration are back at the bargaining table. We've talked with MSP members in every part of the campus. We've put together a streamlined list of proposals that we believe are reasonable and would improve our ability to do the kind of teaching and research that make UMass excellent.

Our proposals include a robust package of compensation proposals, including across the board raises that keep up with inflation, merit pay, increasing PNYR, and making it an on-based salary increase and significantly raising minimum pay at all levels, but especially for NTT faculty and librarians. More funds for professional development and computer replacement, clear language around online teaching and in coordination with other campus unions, improving access to childcare on campus. Also better assistance to international faculty and librarians with their immigration processes and costs and a number of other things. So please, stay tuned on that.

Third item, MSP had a great meeting, speaking of international faculty, with international faculty last week. We discussed a wide range of issues that matter to them, including NTT. As well as tenure system faculty. So if you're interested in joining this group and talking about these issues, please email us.

Fourth, MSP is holding workshops for promotion to full professor next week, on Monday and Tuesday at lunchtime, we still have a few spots left. So if this applies to you, please email us to sign up.

Finally, the MSP connection is back. So this is our social program. We invite MSP members to join us for some fun, cultural, and social activities. This semester we're going to go to a UMass hockey game, to Twelfth Night at the Fine Arts Center, to West Side story at Amherst Cinema in addition to our end of year party, so that for sure will be on our website very soon, and all MSP members are welcome to join us. Thank you.

6. **The President of the Graduate Student Senate**
7. **The President of the Student Government Association**
8. **The Student Trustee**

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Messier: I forgot when my term ends, if I'm one of those people who wants to know when my term ends. Where would I find that information? My term, like as Senator, or on the committee that I'm on?

Secretary Paik: So thank you for the question. That is actually an excellent question. I think the vast majority of us have no idea what our terms end. Fortunately, we have a Senate staff that can answer that question. If you go on the Faculty Senate website, you'll see the membership list where your term year is stated. You can always reach out to the Senate staff for any questions you have about your appointments or terms.

Senator Dori-Hacohen: I'm following up on the MSP. I'm not sure why it is MSP. But I think it is a faculty Senate discussion of the punishment of the student who were demonstrating. So if there is inconsistency with the previous punishment, and maybe we can hear an account as to why to have them to have that punishment, and not a different punishment given to them, following what the MSP member suggested to us, thank you.

Interim Provost Malone: The conduct process is in the Dean of Students office, as I think most of you know. Vice Chancellor Perdomo-Ahmed couldn't stay for the entire meeting. We can take the question back and get you some more details once we can reconvene.

D. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE (ACTING ON ITS WINTER AUTHORITY) ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. **New Course: LABOR 618, "Labor and Public Policy", 4 Credits, CCMS #10522**

MOTION: 16-24 **That the Faculty Senate affirm the actions taken by the Rules Committee on behalf of the Faculty Senate over Winter 2023, as listed on this agenda, Item D.**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 16-24 was Adopted.

E. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. **2022-23 Annual Report of the Commonwealth Honors College Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-034**

   This Report was Received.

2. **2022-23 Annual Report of Health Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-035**

   This Report was Received.

3. **2022-23 Annual Report of University Press Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-036**

   This Report was Received.

4. **2022-23 Annual Report of General Education Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-037**

This Report was Received.

F. SPECIAL REPORT – JOINT TASK FORCE

1. **Joint Task Force for Childcare Needs Assessment- Presentation by Gonen Dori-Hacohen Associate Professor Department of Communication and Co-chair of the Joint Taskforce for Childcare Needs Assessment, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-038.**

This Report was Received.

G. NEW BUSINESS: COURSES (CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

MOTION: 17-24 **That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ARCH 552, CE-ENGIN 606, EDUC 682B, HT-MGT 331, KIN 635, LABOR 619, NURSING 726, NURSING 798SR, POLISCI 872, PSYCH 615, SCH-MGMT 360, SPP 301, and SPP 494D, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education, and Graduate Councils.**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 17-24 was Adopted.

H. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

MOTION: 18-24 **That the Faculty Senate approve (1) Revision of the Social Justice Concentration within the Master of Education, Education Specialist Degree, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-039; (2) Revision of the Social Justice Concentration in the Doctorate of Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-040; (3) Creation of the Certificate in Horticulture, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 24-041.**

Secretary Paik read the motion.

MOTION 18-24 was Adopted.

I. NEW BUSINESS - POLICY

MOTION: 14-24 **That the Faculty Senate approve Revisions to the Policy on Search, Appointment, and Evaluation Procedures for Deans, Associate Deans, Academic Department Chairs and Heads, and Academic Program Directors, as presented in Sen. Doc. 24-032.**

(This is the second of two readings of this motion. This motion was read at the 827th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 16, 2023. The final vote will be taken at this meeting.)

Secretary Paik provided a friendly amendment.

Senator Sher: I just want to clarify the meaning. So the phrase, "except when there are no other departmental faculties who are eligible to serve according to the department bylaws", is that meant to take care of the situation where, say the Personnel Committee is the department of the whole and so, therefore we don't have the option? It just seems to me that the wording is a little bit hard to interpret.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for letting me clarify the language. So basically, the idea is to let certain situations like the committee of the whole situation, but also a small units take members from the personnel committee and put them on the list of potential faculty to serve on the Chair Search Committee. So yes, it's to address both situations.

Friendly amendment accepted.

Senator Dori-Hacohen: Thank you. I have what I think are two friendly amendments to the policy. One is in the same clause. So section 4, regarding the sentence. At least 3/4 of the committee shall be departmental faculty members. I would make the friendly amendment to at least 3/5 of the committee shall be departmental meetings. The logic is that if you have 3/4, it means that if you have an external member and a staff, which I think should be there, then the search committee should have 6 faculty on it. Which for many departments, will be too many faculty to be a functioning search committee. We don't have the resources to have 6 faculty on a chair search committee. If we switch it to 3/5 it means 3 faculty, one staff and one external member. Therefore, that's my first friendly amendment.

The second friendly amendment is in section 7, removal procedure for administrators. I would like to suggest that. In the second part, the bit "the appointing authority after consulting with the affected administrator the petitioners, and the departmental faculty in the case of a chair or the college chairs." I would like to add: "and College Personnel Committee".

I think that if the discussion is between the appointing member and college chairs is strictly within the administrative rank and does not have the college personnel committees, which are faculty. That may or may not be part of the petitioners. So I would suggest adding after "college chairs", "and College Personnel Committee". Thank you.

Secretary Paik: Thank you for the proposals, I think for the first one I would suggest, it is not necessary. That line actually refers to the proportion of faculty that are on the committee that are pulled off the nominations, lists versus those that are appointed by the appointing authority. So by suggesting 3/5, you're actually decreasing the ratio of faculty that are coming off the nomination list and increasing the proportion of faculty that could be appointed by the appointing authority. So I would prefer that the higher number be retained for that reason. The reason why we put specific ratios in there was request from Provost Serio, who requested the ability to appoint faculty members directly onto the search

committee without consultation from a department. So we codified a ratio such that the majority of the faculty members were in this case 3/4 of the faculty members would be from the department, and not appointed directly by the appointing authority. So I would suggest, maybe we retain retaining existing language as opposed to changing the 3/5.

For the second part. That seems to be a new proposal on old language and I would suggest that maybe we can hold that for another time and have it put under study for maybe an adjustment down the road.

So I'd ask that we not make the change.

Friendly amendments not accepted.

Senator Bentley: I interpreted section 2.4 in the same way that you did so. If it's intended to be interpreted that way as three-fourths are from the who the Department nominates, not who the appointing authority nominates, I would suggest, we modify that wording to say "at least 3/4 of the faculty members on the committee be appointed from the list of nominations."

To make sure that it's clear that it's referring to 3/4 of the faculty members, not ¾ of the entire committee. If that makes sense cause. I had the same concern that I thought this would require a search committee to be at least 8 people. I don't think that's what you're intending It to be.

Friendly amendments accepted.

Senator Katz: I see a lot of people have left. We've been arguing over some of the language on this proposal. I don't know what the official Robert's Rules of Order are, I don't have in front of me. But I think we should delay the vote to the next Senate faculty meeting says, because enough issues have been raised to me to not push this forward, you know, with changing the language. I mean, it shouldn't be up to Secretary Paik, deciding whether or not he thinks this is a thing we should have in there or not.

MOTION: To Table Item I. to be amended and voted on at the next Faculty Senate Meeting.

Seconded.

MOTION to Table was Approved. MOTION 14-24 shall appear as Old Business at the 828th meeting.

Adjourned 5:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Anthony Paik, Secretary